DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 801 SP 013 855

AUTHOR Lucas, Ann
TITLE Educational Goals and Values of Students and Teachers: An Exploratory Study.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior; *Educational Objectives; Psychological Patterns; Self Concept; Semantic Differential; *Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Attitudes; *Values

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine educational goals and values held by students and their teachers, incongruencies that exist between these perceptions, and differences between teachers' stated value priorities and their students' observations of actual behavior. The subjects of the study were selected twelfth-grade students and their teachers. Three instruments were used in this research--the interview, the questionnaire, and the semantic differential. Fifty-six goal statements and eight value categories were used in the interview. The questionnaire was structured to consist of forced choice items parallel in form to the goal statements. Semantic differential data was obtained by requesting students to indicate their perceptions of teachers' goals and values and their own opinions on what goals should be stressed in the class. Results indicated that very little differential exists between teachers' and students' perceptions of educational goals and values. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175801

MAR 6 10:40 AM '79

Ann Lucas, Assistant Professor
University of Alabama in Birmingham
Room 228A, Bldg #1
Department of Secondary Instruction and Educational Foundations
Birmingham, AL 35294

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Lucas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP013955

MAR 5 10 49 AM '79

EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND VALUES OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

In recent years, many theories have been proposed to explain the need for innovation and change in the school society. The theoretical writings of school critics and some empirical works suggest that a shift in the values of the younger generation is directly related to the lack of goal direction and implementation within the school society. Although educators have given credence to the relationship of the needs of the society and individuals throughout the history of education, renewed efforts have been generated toward exploring the needs, goals, and values of youth.

The literature expressing concern for educational goals and values is vast. However, the literature seems sparse in studies of the goals and values of both students and teachers viewed simultaneously. Many studies in value education have been focused on college students rather than secondary school students. In general, research has been pursued from the "ought" dimensions of educators thinking about the educational process, rather than from both the "ought" dimensions and from students' perceptions of educational goals and values.

In their discussion of the nature of the classroom group, Getzels and Thelen (1968) state:

> One fundamental concern for teacher and student alike is surely the nature of the group they are establishing. If they are working at cross-purposes, the likelihood of educational achievement is slim, for the chief preoccupation of the individuals will be the problem of dealing with a situation in which they cannot perceive order and consistency--at least not their order and consistency.

SP013858

Getzels and Thelen (1968) provide a paradigm for studying the classroom as a social system. The major components of the paradigm reflect the interrelationships among the anthropological, sociological, and psychological dimensions of human behavior. The expectations of the roles of the institutions, individuals, and class groups must be in some way related to the ethos or cultural values. Within the context of the school society, probably too little attention has been focused upon the cultural dimension, especially as it may relate to students and teachers.

Eisner (1971) has amply referred to workers who reflect their concern for the relationship of the schools' culture and organizational patterns to the resulting affect upon students. He states:

> We have begun to recognize that not only the curriculum as a whole needs attention, but the curriculum press of the school--its implicit curriculum--needs to be attended to intelligently if the programs that are employed are to have effect.

McDonald (1965) has designed a paradigm which is illustrative of an interactive conceptualization of human behavior within the framework of teaching and learning. It is significant that as in the Getzels and Thelen scheme, the individuals (students and teachers) are viewed as personality systems with needs, values, experiences, perceptions, etc. Thus, any differences between these components of the students' and teachers' personality system must be accounted for and dealt with if goals and effectiveness in the instructional system are to be obtained.

If differences exist between the educational goals and values of students and teachers, then change and innovation in schools should be based on educators' understanding of the students' perceptions of educational goals and values as well as their own. The accomplishment of this task is predicated

upon more research efforts which are directed toward the study of the educational goals and values of both students and teachers.

The investigator perceived that an exploratory study utilizing the techniques employed in this study, along with microcosmic empiricism may serve to clarify the nature of goals and values within the school society.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to explore the nature of educational goals and values held by a selected group of students and their teachers. More specifically, this research attempted to determine:

1. The educational goals and values held by a selected group of students and their teachers.
2. The incongruency which may exist between the educational goals and values of these students and their teachers.
3. The students' perceptions of their teachers' educational goals and their values.

Method

Subjects

The study was pursued in two classroom settings in which the students (twenty-eight per class) of those classes (twelfth grade) and their teachers were subjects.

Development of the Instruments

Three instruments were designed to be used in the study: the interview rank-order schedule; the questionnaire; and the semantic differential. Since the study was designed to use alternative ways to measure the same variables, the initial and most crucial procedure was to: (1) determine the goal statements and related value categories to be used in the construction of the instruments; (2) determine whether the goal statements could be properly categorized into the value categories; and (3) assess the difficulty and appropriateness of the statements from the perception of a small sample of the subjects. Previous to the development of the instruments, semi-structured interview sessions were held with students and teachers in junior and senior

high school settings to illicit goals and values responses, and the literature was searched for goals and values which educators suggest should be sought in schools.

Resulting from this initial effort, a values category system was devised and goal statements were written to reflect the definitions of each of the categories. An in-service group of educators consisting of public school teachers, administrators and full-time graduate students were requested to categorize the goal statements by writing the value category which the statements seemed to fit best. Based on these findings, ten categories were reduced to eight and ninety original statements to fifty-six.

A selected group of two teachers, two full-time graduate students, and one administrator were requested to sort the fifty-six goals statements into the eight values categories. Based on these responses and further interviews with students and teachers to assess the meanings of the statements to them, some of the statements were revised. The judges were again requested to sort the statements.

An interview rank-order schedule was devised using a final listing of seven interview questions and the fifty-six goal statements and eight value categories.

The questionnaire was structured to consist of fifty-six force choice items which are parallel in form to the goal statements from the interview rank-order instrument.

The concepts used in the semantic differential were selected from the high and low ranked responses of the rank-order data.

Method of Analysis

The analyses of these data were carried out using the following statistical treatments:

1. Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W, was used in order to determine the degree of agreement or association among the ranks assigned to the categories by all subjects.
2. In instances where significant differences were obtained between the category rankings, the large sample approximation to the multiple comparison procedure (1973), based on Friedman's rank sums, was used to determine which categories were ranked differently.
3. The multiple comparison procedure was followed by the use of priority of ranks in order to make the "best" estimate of the true rankings.
4. The Kendall procedure was then used to determine differences in category rankings between the classes and teachers as separate groups, and also to determine if all subjects differed significantly in their ratings.
5. Where significant differences were found between the subjects as raters, the sign test was used to determine the differences between the classes and between the teachers as separate groups. The significance test was based upon the binomial distribution using the two-tail test.
6. Finally, the mean ratings of the categories for both classes and then for both teachers were determined. These scores were re-ranked and Kendall's procedure was used to determine if the ratings between categories were significantly different when these ranks were compared.

Results

The Rank-Order Data

Table 1 indicates the ranks of the means per category for both students and teachers.

Table 1

Mean Ratings With Ranks: Students' And Teachers' Educational Goals and Values

Categories[a]	Subjects							
	Class A		Teacher A		Class B		Teacher B	
A	5.714	(7)	5.571	(6)	5.658	(6)	4.571	(6)
B	3.577	(3)	2.571	(1)	3.180	(2)	3.286	(2)
C	5.240	(5)	6.286	(7)	5.236	(5)	6.571	(8)
D	3.600	(4)	2.857	(2)	3.397	(3)	3.857	(3.5)
E	6.131	(8)	4.286	(5)	5.944	(8)	3.143	(1)
F	5.366	(6)	7.857	(8)	5.801	(7)	6.428	(7)
G	2.948	(1)	3.571	(4)	3.066	(1)	3.857	(3.5)
H	3.400	(2)	3.000	(3)	3.646	(4)	4.285	(5)

[a]The categories listed alphabetically are aesthetic, character, economic, intellectual, physical, power, psychological, and social.

The ranks of the categories are significantly different at the .02 level of significance using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance W. The use of the multiple comparison procedure revealed that the categories which differ significantly are character and power.

The "best" estimate of the true rankings indicates the following priority of ranks from most to least important: character, psychological, intellectual, social, physical, aesthetic, economic, and power.

The test for the differences in category rankings between classes and between teachers indicated no significant differences between the rankings given.

There was no significant difference between the subjects as raters.

The analysis of the questionnaire data described below represents another method of assessing the goals and values of these students and their teachers as compared to their responses to the rank-order instrument.

The Questionnaire Data

Since the students responded twice, the questionnaire data are reported in two sections: (1) Students' Perceptions of Their Teachers' Goals and Values; and (2) Students' and Teachers' Goals and Values. Teacher subjects responded once in terms of their perceptions of their own goals and values.

Table 2 indicates the ranks of the means of the categories for students and teachers. The ranks of the categories are significantly different at the .004 level of significance using Kendall's coefficient of concordance W.

According to the multiple comparison procedure, the categories which differ significantly at this level are: (1) character and power; (2) character and physical; and (3) character and power.

The "best" estimates of the true rankings indicate the following priority of category ranks from highest to lowest: character, intellectual, social, psychological, aesthetic, physical, power, or economic.

The test for the differences in category rankings between classes indicated that the ranks were significantly different at the .09 level of significance. The indications are that there are no significant differences between the categories when the rankings of the students' and teachers' are treated separately.

Table 2

Mean Ratings With Ranks: Students' Perceptions of Their Teachers' Goals and Values and Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves

Categories[a]	Subjects			
	Class A	Teacher A	Class B	Teacher B
A	2.295 (7)	2.714 (4)	2.398 (5)	2.143 (4)
B	3.006 (1)	3.857 (1)	2.893 (1)	2.428 (1)
C	2.290 (8)	1.000 (8)	2.275 (6)	2.000 (7)
D	2.778 (3)	2.714 (4)	2.702 (4)	2.286 (2)
E	2.437 (5)	2.714 (4)	2.139 (8)	2.000 (7)
F	2.326 (6)	1.143 (7)	2.267 (7)	2.000 (7)
G	2.780 (2)	2.143 (6)	2.730 (2)	2.143 (4)
H	2.736 (4)	3.286 (2)	2.704 (3)	2.143 (4)

[a]The categories listed alphabetically are aesthetic, character, economic, intellectual, physical, power, psychological, and social.

The results of the ranks used to determine whether the raters differ significantly in their ratings of these categories indicates significant difference at the .018 level of significance. This indicates that the raters are different in their ratings.

In order to further determine if significant differences existed between classes and teachers in their ratings, the sign test was applied. The results indicated that no significant differences existed among either of the two groups when treated separately. When the mean scores are compared by subjects, the largest discrepancy is between teacher scores rather than between classes or between the individual classes or their teachers. However, this is not a significant difference. Thus, differences which seem to exist between students and teachers are between the ratings of class A and teacher B rather than each

of the classes and their teachers. Further, it seems that class A and their teacher tend to rate more positively than class B and their teacher.

The rankings of the mean scores of the two classes were then compared with those of the teachers in order to test for differences in category ratings. No significant differences were determined between the category ratings. Consequently, priority of ranks could not be assigned.

In addition to other statistical treatments used, the Kuder-Richardson Formulas 20 and 21 were also used to estimate the reliability of the instrument. The reliability estimates for the student subjects per class were .89 and .88, respectively.

Table 3 indicates the ranks of the means of each category by the students and their teachers. The ranks of the categories are significantly different at the .005 level of significance. The multiple comparison procedure indicated that the categories which differ significantly are: (1) aesthetic and character; (2) character and economic; (3) character and physical; and (4) character and power.

The "best" estimate of the true rankings indicate the following priority of ranks from highest to lowest: character, intellectual, social, psychological, physical, aesthetic, economic, and power.

Table 3

Mean Rating With Ranks:
Students' and Teachers' Goals and Values

Categories[a]	Subjects			
	Class A	Teacher A	Class B	Teacher B
A	2.387 (7)	2.714 (4)	2.332 (8)	2.143 (4)
B	3.132 (1)	3.857 (1)	3.039 (1)	2.428 (1)
C	3.430 (6)	1.000 (8)	2.456 (5)	2.000 (7)
D	2.868 (3)	2.714 (4)	2.650 (3.5)	2.286 (2)
E	2.449 (5)	2.714 (4)	2.381 (6)	2.000 (7)
F	2.316 (8)	1.143 (7)	2.363 (7)	2.000 (7)
G	2.895 (2)	2.143 (6)	2.782 (2)	2.143 (4)
H	2.804 (4)	3.286 (2)	2.650 (3.5)	2.143 (4)

[a]The categories listed alphabetically are aesthetic, character, economic, intellectual, physical, power, psychological, and social.

Further significance tests for the differences in the categories as ranked between the classes and between the teachers indicated significance levels of .06 and .09, respectively. The indications are that there are no significant differences between the rankings of these categories.

When the ranks were used to determine whether the raters differ significantly in their ratings of the categories, significant differences were indicated at the .014 level of significance.

In order to further determine if significant differences existed between the classes as raters and then the teachers as raters, the sign test was applied. The results indicated that no significant differences existed between the classes nor the teachers when treated separately. Thus, a comparison of mean scores by categories when all of the subjects ratings are compared seems

to indicate that the significant differences which exist are the result of the ratings of class A and teacher B, rather than each of the classes and their teachers.

When the mean scores of the classes were combined and compared with the rankings of the combined scores of the teachers, there existed no significant difference between the categories.

Using the Kuder-Richardson Formulas 20 and 21 to estimate the reliability of the instrument, the estimates for the student subjects per class were .897 and .891, respectively.

The analysis of the semantic differential data which follows represents another method of assessing the goals and values of these students and their teachers as compared to their responses to the rank-order and questionnaire instruments.

The Semantic Differential Data

The semantic differential data are reported in two sections. Students were requested to indicate (1) their perceptions of the teachers' goals and values, and (2) their own opinions about what goals should be stressed in the class. Teacher subjects responded once in terms of their attitudes toward the goals.

Table 4 indicates the means and their ranks of each category for all subjects. The significance level, .016, indicates that the ranks of the categories are significantly different.

Table 4

Mean Ratings With Ranks: Students' Perceptions of Their Teachers' Goals and Values and Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves

Categories[a]	Subjects			
	Class A	Teacher A	Class B	Teacher B
A	2.548 (2)	2.000 (6)	4.307 (8)	1.778 (3)
B	2.412 (1)	1.278 (4)	2.738 (2)	1.389 (2)
C	2.935 (6)	4.722 (8)	2.961 (5)	3.333 (8)
D	2.607 (5)	1.000 (1)	2.681 (1)	1.167 (1)
E	3.005 (7)	1.778 (5)	3.119 (6)	2.000 (4)
F	3.336 (8)	4.000 (7)	3.262 (7)	3.278 (7)
G	2.563 (3)	1.111 (2)	2.874 (3)	2.333 (6)
H	2.597 (4)	1.222 (3)	2.924 (4)	2.278 (5)

[a]The categories are aesthetic, character, economic, intellectual, physical, power, psychological, and social.

The multiple comparison procedure indicated that the categories which differ significantly are: (1) character and economic; (2) character and power; (3) economic and intellectual; and (4) intellectual and power.

The "best" estimate of the true rankings indicates the following priority of ranks: intellectual, character, psychological, social, aesthetic, physical, economic, and power.

The test for differences in category rankings between classes and between teachers indicated that there are no significant differences between the categories when these two groups are treated separately.

There were no significant differences between the raters and their ratings of the categories.

The mean ratings of the two classes were then compared with those of the teachers in order to test for differences in category ratings. The significance level, .08, indicates that the rankings of the categories are not significantly different. Therefore, differences between the categories could not be determined and priority of rankings could not be assigned.

Table 5 indicates the means and their associated rankings for each category by the students and their teachers. The significance level, .038, indicates that the rankings of the categories are significantly different.

Table 5

Mean Ratings With Ranks:
Students' and Teachers' Goals and Values

Categories[a]	Subjects			
	Class A	Teacher A	Class B	Teacher B
A	2.716 (8)	2.000 (6)	2.847 (6)	1.778 (3)
B	1.996 (1)	1.278 (4)	2.531 (2)	1.389 (2)
C	2.710 (7)	4.723 (8)	2.831 (5)	3.334 (8)
D	2.502 (4)	1.000 (1)	2.607 (4)	1.167 (1)
E	2.511 (5)	1.889 (5)	2.882 (7)	2.000 (4)
F	2.380 (3)	4.000 (7)	3.186 (8)	3.278 (7)
G	2.178 (2)	1.110 (2)	2.440 (1)	2.334 (6)
H	2.580 (6)	1.222 (3)	2.555 (3)	2.278 (5)

[a]The categories are aesthetic, character, economic, intellectual, physical, power, psychological, and social.

The multiple comparison procedure indicated that the categories which differ significantly are: (1) character and economic; and (2) economic and intellectual.

The "best" estimate of the true rankings indicates the following priority of ranks: character, intellectual, psychological, social, physical, aesthetic, power, and economic.

Further significance tests for the differences in the categories as ranked between the separate groups of classes and teachers indicated that no significant differences existed between the categories. Thus, no priority of ranks could be assigned.

The raters did not differ significantly in their ratings of the categories.

The mean ratings of the two classes were then compared with those of the teachers in order to test for differences in category ratings. The significance level of .08 indicated that the rankings of the categories were not significantly different. Therefore, differences between the categories could not be determined and priority of ranks could not be assigned.

Summary and Conclusions

Three instruments were designed to explore the nature of educational goals and values held by a selected group of student subjects and their teachers. The findings are reported in terms of the defined purposes of the study for each of the instruments.

The Rank-Order Schedule

Since the test for significant differences between the ratings of the students and teachers indicated no significant differences between their ratings, it appears that: (1) the educational goals and values of both students and teachers are the same; and (2) there is no incongruency between the educational goals and values of these students and their teachers.

Since the test for differences in category rankings between teachers indicated no significant differences, the differences must be assessed on the basis of the differences indicated when the ranks of all groups were compared. The evidence suggests that the categories are not entirely independent. Clusters of responses tend to exist with respect to the categories. Thus, instead of eight possible differences, the differences seem to exist between one set of categories such as character, intellectual, psychological, and social; and another set of categories such as the aesthetic, economic, physical, and power categories. According to the data which suggest the estimation of the true rankings, the educational goals and values of these groups from most to least important are character, psychological, intellectual, social, physical, aesthetic, economic, and power.

The Questionnaire

The data from both (1) the students' perceptions of their teachers' goals and values and teachers' perceptions of themselves; and (2) the students' and teachers' goals and values tend to indicate that the students' perceptions of their teachers' goals and values are the same as the teachers' perceptions of themselves, and that incongruency does not exist between the educational goals and values of these students and their teachers. Although the evidence suggests that significant differences did exist between the raters on both instruments, the data seem to suggest that the difference is produced between the ratings of class A and teacher B, rather than each of the classes and their teachers.

The data from the rankings of the categories tends to suggest no significant differences in category rankings between classes nor between teachers. Thus, any differences in these rankings must be assessed from the results obtained when the ratings of all groups were compared. The evidence suggests that there is a great deal of internal consistency of the ranks of the class groups; this evidence seems to be based on the fact that the categories form clusters between the categories which are rated in the agree range of the scale and those rated in the disagree range. Based on the estimation of the priority of the category rankings, the educational goals and values of these subjects are character, intellectual or social, psychological, aesthetic, physical, power, and economic (or economic and power).

The Semantic Differential

The results of the analysis based on the ranks of the mean scores per category tend to indicate that the students' perceptions of their teachers'

goals and values are the same as the teachers' perceptions of themselves. There were no significant differences between the students and teachers as raters, nor did differences exist when the two groups were treated separately.

The data for both administrations of the semantic differential suggests that incongruency does not exist between the educational goals and values of these students and their teachers. The data from the rankings of the categories tend to indicate no significant differences between classes nor between teachers. However, when the rankings of all subjects were compared, significant differences were found between their rankings of the categories. The priority of ranks for these subjects, on both instruments, tend to differ within the framework of clusters. The priority of ranks are intellectual, character, psychological, social, aesthetic, physical, economic, and power (or character, intellectual, psychological, social, physical, aesthetic, power, and economic).

Projections for Further Study

Since there is evidence for the reliability of using these three instruments to assess goals and values (since they do indeed seem to be assessing the same variables), the first projection for further study is related to instrumentation. It is suggested that the determination of the concepts (goals) used to build the category system which are unquestionably different in meaning will lead to differences between the categories. It is hypothesized that fewer categories will be needed. After this is achieved, it is further hypothesized that any one of the three instruments may be of utility in assessing values.

The total number of concepts used in the other two instruments should be used in the semantic differential. The total wording of the goal statements should be used in the semantic differential as in the other instruments. This may mean longer statements for the use of this instrument, but there is evidence that longer statements and/or paragraphs have been successfully used.

The investigator feels that there is further advantage in using the semantic differential to assess the connotative meanings of educational goals in depth. The underlying notion in the construction of the instruments used in this study was that each of the concepts are representative of a given category. It may well be that certain educational goals and values are so close together in meaning that the possibility of finding significant differences between them is unlikely.

If classroom studies are preferred by an investigator, then the preferred data treatment should perhaps be to obtain discrepancy scores by comparing each student's value score with the individual teacher score rather than attempting to generalize across class groups. Also, it would appear that this observation indicates the advantage of classroom studies prior to pursuing studies involving larger samples.

It is further projected that after further improvements in instrumentation have been made, sociological variables suchas economic status, younger and older persons, teachers and students, and race be assessed. This last projection is made in view of the current trends used in values studies and the hypotheses which are emphasized regarding the differences in the cultural orientations of the above mentioned groups. If then differences are found, the implications for teaching and learning will be immeasurable.

References

Eisner, Elliot W., Confronting Curriculum Reform. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971, pp. 1-16.

Getzels, Jacob W., and Thelen, Herbert A., "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System," Teaching: Vantage Points for Study. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1968, p. 238.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Thelen, Herbert A., "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System," Teaching: Vantage Points for Study. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1968, p. 239.

Hollander, Myles and Wolfe, Douglas A., Nonparametric Statistical Methods. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973, pp. 151-177.

McDonald, James and Leeper, Robert R. (Eds.), Theories of Instruction. Washington, D.C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965, pp. 3-6.